

what seemed at times to be insurmountable hurdles. Yitzhak Rabin was critical to keeping the delicate process moving forward. This, however, was not his only accomplishment since he began his second term as Prime Minister in 1993. Prime Minister Rabin orchestrated the Israel-Jordan Peace Treaty, the normalization of relations between Israel and Tunisia, Israel and Morocco, and the acceptance of Israel by many others in the Arab world and around the globe.

Mr. President, on November 6, I joined some 4,500 members of Detroit's distinguished Jewish Community to pay tribute to Yitzhak Rabin at a memorial ceremony organized in my State by the Detroit Jewish community Council and the Detroit Jewish Federation. It was an incredibly moving experience for me and my wife Jane. We listened to Jewish leaders from Detroit talk about their memories of the slain Israeli leader and all he had meant to the Jewish people. I especially was struck by the message of the last individual who spoke that evening, Rabbi Steven Wiel. During his remarks, Rabbi Wiel posed the following question: "Do we not love what we love more than we hate what we hate? Do we not love the chance for peace, do we not love the state of Israel, do we not love our Jewish brethren, do we not love human life more than we may hate decisions made by political leaders with whom we may disagree?"

Mr. President, the hatred that Rabbi Wiel spoke of may have been acted upon by Yigal Amir in Tel Aviv on November 4, but it exists in various forms throughout the Middle East and in too many other places in the world. This hatred can be found in individuals of all faiths and of all nationalities. And if we truly are committed to a lasting peace in the Middle East, we not only must help Israel overcome its most recent tragedy, but we must also unite leaders from the entire region against the hatred of those who have tried and will continue to try to derail this peace process through heinous and murderous crimes. In this vein, I have already pledged my strong support for Mr. Rabin's successor, Shimon Peres, and I commend Israel's leaders from across the political spectrum for seeking to unify the Israeli people during this tragic time. It is absolutely essential that the United States stand behind Prime Minister Peres and the citizens of Israel as they work to overcome this crisis and continue to work toward peace.

I believe the greatest way the United States can pay tribute to our partner, Yitzhak Rabin, is to continue to assist the efforts of those trying to make peace in the Middle East. Any peace that is achieved forever will be attached to the name of Israeli leader and peacemaker Yitzhak Rabin.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I send a bill to the desk. I ask it be properly referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be properly referred.

MR. GLENN. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. GLENN and Mr. DEWINE pertaining to the introduction of S. 1439 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. D'AMATO addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

BOSNIA

Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, our Nation has always been willing to fight for the values and freedoms that our Nation, our flag, and our Constitution represents. We have always met that test. America and Americans have always stepped forward. My father served in World War II, my uncles, our neighbors, sons, daughters. That was a time and a war when every American understood that our basic way of life was being threatened. There was a direct obligation for each and every American to do his or her part, and Americans met that challenge, and individuals were willing to face the dangers of loss of life to protect and preserve the freedoms that the next generation of Americans share today.

Mr. President, I submit, there is no compelling American interest in Bosnia that meets that standard that would jeopardize or put our children and our grandchildren in such a dangerous situation. It is an unwinnable, untenable civil war in a place called Bosnia.

As a parent, I do not wish my sons or daughters put in harm's way, and I cannot imagine that any other parent would be willing to risk the lives of their children in a peacekeeping operation in Bosnia.

The President has not made a compelling case to sacrifice one American life, let alone place 20,000 U.S. troops in a dangerous, dangerous situation. Sending American troops to Bosnia is unnecessary, it is wrong, and I will oppose it with every fiber in my body.

Mr. President, I will have more to say about that. But let me suggest to you, getting 20,000 troops in may look somewhat grand as they come marching off, as the tanks roll in, as there will be crowds well orchestrated for the TV cameras to see them cheering, but how long will they have to serve? How will they get them out? Do we really believe they are going to come out in 1 year? The administration is already wiggling on this. How many lives will be lost?

This administration's track record in being able to keep its promises and meet its obligations in similar situations has not been a good one. Certainly, it was a disaster in Somalia, when a mission that started out as one for peacekeeping and one to give food to people was changed.

Certainly, as things are unraveling today in Haiti, we have every reason to believe that upon the withdrawal, if our American troops are withdrawn on time, there will be an unraveling, once again, and the citizens of Haiti will find themselves, once again, at war.

I think it is naive to really think that by putting 20,000 troops—and by the way, there are going to be about 40,000 troops in that region, 20,000 in Bosnia. The cost is astronomical, not to mention the danger to our troops.

I think it is absolutely disingenuous for the administration to now come forward and say the United States will lose prestige abroad because they brokered this peace on the basis of sending U.S. troops there. They were warned repeatedly by this Congress, by this body, by the House of Representatives, that clearly we were opposed to sending troops there, and to say now that we are going to be having them there and for us to be less than supportive, and that this would embarrass the President, embarrass the Nation, endanger our relations with NATO is to ignore the fact that the President deliberately undertook this operation, was well aware of the opposition of the citizens of the United States and of the Congress and does not—and does not—deserve at this point in time our support.

Our support should be to protect the lives of our U.S. troops, to see to it that if we are going to enter a conflict—and this is a conflict that has been brewing for hundreds of years—that there is a vital national interest.

Should we work to bring about peace? Yes. But I suggest putting 20,000 troops in and promising to take them out in 1 year is not going to end over 500 years of hostility. It is wrong.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMPSON). The clerk will call the roll. The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, are we in morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

THE DEPLOYMENT OF UNITED STATES TROOPS TO BOSNIA

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, the entire Nation has its attention on the deployment of United States Forces to Bosnia. Congressional hearings on the peace agreement began this week. The President received a NATO troop deployment plan for the implementation force today. Many of my colleagues have made statements on the issue.

I have long urged that we lift the arms embargo in Bosnia and let the Bosnians defend themselves. This would have been the best option for Bosnia and the United States. It would

have been the legally, morally, and strategically correct approach. Lifting the arms embargo would have also been the best way to avoid sending United States troops to Bosnia. In fact, had we done that, lifted the arms embargo, we would not be talking today about deployment of U.S. Forces.

The record should be clear. We are where we are today because the President repeatedly—and let me repeat, repeatedly—rejected Congress' bipartisan effort to lift the embargo.

We should also be clear at this end of Pennsylvania Avenue. It is time for a reality check in the Congress. The fact is that President Clinton has decided to send United States Forces to Bosnia. The fact is that these troops will be sent—and indeed some are already there. The fact is by next week, there will be a couple thousand American soldiers on the ground in Bosnia.

The President has the constitutional power as Commander in Chief to send these forces. The Congress cannot stop this troop deployment from happening. The President and senior advisers have repeatedly said they will proceed with the deployment, whatever the Congress does. If we would try to cut off funds we would harm the men and women in the military who have already begun to arrive in Bosnia.

So we should find a way, if possible, to support the American men and women in uniform on their way to Bosnia and who will be in Bosnia—I assume a full 20,000, they say, by February.

Like all Americans, I have real concerns about this operation. First, I am concerned about the possibility of American casualties. The men and women of our Armed Forces are volunteers. But that does not make their lives any less valuable than those of draftees or any other category. They know the risks. We have an obligation to do all we can to reduce those risks. We can reduce the risk to American Forces by limiting their mission to enforcing only military provisions of the peace agreement: That means no Somalia-like nation-building.

We can also reduce the threat to U.S. Forces by making it crystal clear that any attack on our troops will be met with an overwhelming, rapid, and decisive response. No more cumbersome command arrangements limiting ability to retaliate—no more U.N. second-guessing or dual key veto authority. The United Nations will not be involved. This is a NATO operation. It will be an American general making these decisions.

The second major concern is that American Forces will be drawn into a quagmire with no way out. Many people are concerned about that because the administration has not articulated an exit strategy; and setting an arbitrary date is not an exit strategy.

Bring them out in a year—what does that mean? That is not a strategy. Who knows what the strategy is?

The President has a plan to get us into Bosnia but no realistic plan to get us out. Keeping Bosnia defenseless is

not an exit strategy. Relying on Utopian arms control schemes is no exit strategy. Relying on unnamed third parties is not an exit strategy.

The United States must have its own exit strategy to control its own destiny. We should not be dependent on the good will or actions of other nations. The only way to make certain that United States Forces will be able to leave in a timely and honorable way is to ensure that the Bosnians are provided the means to defend themselves when we leave.

What is needed is a concrete effort, led by the United States, to arm and train the Bosnians. This effort should not be contingent on so-called build-down provisions in the Dayton agreement.

I understand administration officials said this morning that the United States or NATO would not be involved in enabling Bosnia to defend itself. In my view, it is an abdication of responsibility to rely on unspecified third countries to create the conditions that allow withdrawal of American forces. The sooner we start to enable Bosnians to defend themselves the sooner United States Forces can come home.

In my view, the definition of success of this deployment must include a real end to the war—that is only possible with the creation of a stable military balance which enables Bosnia to defend itself. Anything less simply exposes American Forces to great risks in order to monitor a temporary interlude in the fighting. In other words, I guess if they all came home next year there might be a temporary interlude to get us through the November activities of 1996, and I am not certain it would last very long.

Over the coming days—in fact, we have been working on it a couple of days—we will be working on a resolution that I hope the majority of my colleagues can support. We have not yet seen the final NATO implementation plan. In fact, as I said earlier, the President just received it today. I do not want to make a snap judgment. I hope we can fashion a resolution that offers support to our military forces, that helps reduce the risk they face, and that ensures American Forces come home as soon as possible with a successful mission accomplished.

I urge my colleagues to not make this a partisan issue. I have been debating issues like this in the Senate floor for 20-some years. I was debating cut off of funds in the Vietnam war, and my colleague, Senator McCain was a prisoner of war. We stood on this floor day after day after day beating off efforts to shut off funding which I thought would have a direct impact on men in the service like JOHN MCCAIN and others who were in that part of the world. We had some success.

Let me suggest that the overwhelming votes to lift the arms embargo were bipartisan. They were Democrats, Republicans, and they were bipartisan with bipartisan leadership.

I believe the best foreign policy is conducted with bipartisan support. I

know that the Senate votes on Lebanon and the gulf war were much more partisan in my view than they should have been.

Indeed, I was dismayed, as I have said before, in the gulf crisis there was not a single member of the Democratic leadership in either the House or the Senate, when we already had troops on the ground, that would support President Bush's decision to protect American interests in the operation Desert Storm.

I have had a long feeling that once the troops were deployed—which is going to happen; it is already happening—that we have some obligation to ensure their safe and honorable return. I have often and long felt it is too important for partisan posture. I know the easy vote on this is “no, no.”

I hope that some of my colleagues will look at it very carefully. We are talking about troops that have been committed. They are on their way. They will be there next week. We are going to be debating this next week on the Senate floor. Someone will say no troops should be deployed. It will be a little late for that, so it is probably not a difficult vote.

Others of us, hopefully on both sides of the aisle, want to make certain, as I have said, that we have a way to get out. It is not hard to get in, but we need a way to get out. We need an exit strategy. We need to make certain that the Bosnians are armed and trained. We need to take on that responsibility.

I know the Bosnians tried to secure that assurance in Dayton, OH, without success. If we do not have that, how do we leave? When do we leave? How long will it take?

I just hope we can all work together in the coming days to fashion a resolution which supports our military forces, reduces the risk they face, and brings them home as soon as possible. Some would say, “Well, if you do this, you are supporting the President of the United States.” I say that is all right with me. We have one President at a time. He is the Commander in Chief. He has made this decision. I do not agree with it. I think it is a mistake.

We had a better option, many better options. But as I said, he repeatedly rejected those options. Now it is up to high noon. The troops are on the way. They are from Kansas, from Arizona, from Tennessee, they are from Ohio, they are from all over America. They are looking to us for support. They are looking for us to make their job just as safe and just as secure as possible.

I believe we do that. The bottom line, the President intends to send these troops one way or the other. He has made it very clear. He has told us that. It has been in the paper. I think we have the responsibility, as I said, in the Congress, to try to ensure to our best ability, that as this deployment goes forward, that we create the conditions to end it quickly and successfully so

that the U.S. Forces can return to their families.

I am very happy to yield the floor. I know my colleague from Arizona wanted to make a statement.

OUR MISSION IN BOSNIA

Mr. MCCAIN. I congratulate the distinguished majority leader on a statesmanlike and nonpartisan statement. I will briefly add to it. Again, I hope his statement is paid attention to by colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

I would like to restate in my opening remark what the distinguished majority leader has just stated, what we must understand, and what should be a framework for whatever debate ensues next week on the floor.

The American people and my colleagues should understand one salient fact. The President will be sending 20,000 Americans to Bosnia for 1 year, whether we approve or disapprove.

We can argue about whether the President should have made the commitment almost 3 years ago to participate in the peace implementation force in Bosnia. As Senator DOLE just stated, there are many other options I would have preferred to have employed besides this one. I would not have made that commitment. But the reality is the President did so commit and those troops are going to Bosnia.

The President has the authority under the Constitution to do so, and he intends to exercise that authority with or without our approval. We can cut off funding, but the President will veto, and his veto will, without any doubt, be sustained. Even if we should force the President to renege on his commitment, we should understand that there would be very negative consequences to such an action. The credibility of the word of the U.S. President is an enormous strategic value of the American people and essential to our security. I urge my Republican colleagues to consider, in their deliberations on this question, how high a premium they would place on the credibility of a Republican President and place that same premium on this President's credibility. Our friends and enemies do not discriminate between Republican and Democratic Presidents when the word of an American President is given. When the President's word is no longer credible abroad, all Americans are less safe.

Another consequence would be the severe damage to the stability of NATO, the most successful defensive alliance in history.

And, finally, all signatories to the peace agreement have stated that, absent United States participation in the implementation force, the war in Bosnia will reignite. I repeat, the war in Bosnia will reignite and the atrocities we have all come to abhor will continue.

Therefore, I intend to do everything in my power to ensure that our mission in Bosnia is, as the President said it

would be, clear, limited and achievable, that it has the greatest chance for success with the least risk to the lives of our young men and women. That is our responsibility as much as the President's, and I intend to take that responsibility very seriously.

We can best achieve this by ensuring that our Armed Forces do not engage in any nonmilitary activities such as refugee resettlement or other nation-building activities for which they are not trained. Therefore, we should condition our authorization of this deployment on the prohibition against our forces enforcing any other aspect of this agreement, other than the military provisions of the military annex to the general framework agreement.

Further, we must ensure that the goals of their mission are clear and achievable and will justify, to some extent, the risk we will incur. A clear exit strategy is not time based but goal based. We must ensure that the peace we enforce for 12 months has a realistic prospect to endure in the 13th, 14th, 15th month and, hopefully, for years beyond that.

Essential to that goal is a stable military balance. To achieve that balance, we will have to see to it that the Bosnian federation has the means and the training to provide for its own defense from aggression after we have withdrawn. Therefore, I believe our authorization of this deployment must be conditioned on the concrete assurance that the United States will do whatever is necessary, although without using our soldiers who are part of the implementation force, to ensure that the Bosnians can defend themselves at the end of our mission.

Some will want to pursue military equilibrium through the arms buildup envisioned in the agreement, but to assume in a few months we can persuade all parties to build down to rough military equilibrium is incredibly naive. We should rightly have little faith in the prospects of arms control negotiations in such a short period. Therefore, we must insist that before we leave in a year there is a stable military balance which will have been achieved by helping the Bosnians to acquire the arms and the training to defend themselves that we have denied them for 4 years.

In closing, let me again urge my Republican colleagues to consider very carefully the institution of the Presidency as they deliberate on this very difficult question. I spent much of my life defending the credibility and the honor of the United States. I have no intention of evading that responsibility now.

Therefore, I intend to work on a resolution with Senator DOLE and, hopefully, all of my Senate colleagues, that will maximize the prospects for the success of the mission and minimize American casualties. I am fully aware that in doing so, I will bear some of the responsibility in the event the mission fails. I do so readily, because my first

responsibility is to do everything in my power to support and protect the fine young Americans we will send to Bosnia and to ensure that whatever sacrifices they will endure, they will have done so for a cause that was worthy and winnable.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, let me just take a moment to thank my colleague from Arizona. He knows as well as I do what the public opinion polls are showing; 80 percent, in some cases higher, "Do not send the troops." As we have tried to point out, that is not the option anymore. The option is to have an exit strategy and to make certain that in that exit strategy we train the Bosnians so they can be an independent force to defend themselves so we can come home; second, to take every step we can to ensure the casualties will be as low as possible.

The Senator from Arizona is not unaccustomed to courage and making courageous stands—this is another example—in the face of public opinion. But that is what leadership is all about. I have to believe, once the Americans are there starting next week and once the images on television are of Americans and the children and the families and the security they have, the attitude of Americans will change.

The Senator from Arizona made a point that I think deserves repeating. That is, NATO—NATO has been very important. It has preserved freedom for a half century. We have given our word. In effect, we are NATO, as far as I am concerned, the United States. Without the United States as a partner in NATO, you would not have NATO.

But, in addition, the President of the United States, without consulting Congress, but it was the President of the United States in 1993 who, in effect, gave his word that the United States, if there were peace to keep, would send 20,000 Americans as part of a 60,000-member force. Then we invited all the parties to come to Ohio, to Dayton, OH, where they stayed for about 3 weeks. The implication was clear. The Americans had taken over the negotiations. The peace talks had broken down. I talked with the Prime Minister of Bosnia less than 3 hours ago. They were all packed, ready to go home; then Mr. Milosevic, the President of Serbia, made some concessions. But the implication throughout was that the United States would be the principal player. You cannot have peace, according to him, unless the United States is present. Not that they do not have great respect for the Europeans who have been there and the U.N. Protection Forces for the past several years, who lost about 200 lives total.

So, it seems to me that our responsibility now is not to say we are going to pass some resolution here that says—it is only two lines long: "The Senate is opposed to deploying U.S. forces." Let me repeat. They are going to be there next week, about 3,000.